

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 18, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 18-19 and 21-32 remain in this application, where claims 3-5, 8-17 and 20 had been canceled without prejudice and claims 25-32 had been added.

In the Office Action, claims 19 and 22 are objected to for certain informalities. In response, claims 19 and 22 have been amended to remove the noted informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the objection of claims 19 and 22 has been overcome and an indication as such is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 6-7, 18-19 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by JP 2002-014359 (Masahide). Claims 1-2, 6-7, 18-19, 21, 23-25 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,273,475 (Oshikawa). Claim 21 is rejected under

35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Masahide in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,592,623 (Yamamoto). Claims 26-27 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Masahide in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0003711 (Hashimoto). Claims 26-27 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Oshikawa in view of Hashimoto. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-2, 6-7, 18-19 and 21-32 are patentable over Masahide, Oshikawa Yamamoto and Hashimoto for at least the following reasons.

Masahide is directed to a method and device for manufacturing liquid crystal display curved surface panel, where a first substrate S1 is held on a curved surface 113 of a stage 11. Liquid crystal material L is disposed between the first substrate S1 and a second substrate S2, shown in FIG 2. The two substrates are shown FIGs 11-12 as P1, p2. The second substrate S2 is pressed on the first substrate S1 by what is termed a pressurizing member 12 shown in FIG 2 to form a laminated curve panel. Thus, the Masahide curved display panel is formed by pressure or force applied by the pressurizing member 12 against the curved surface 113 of the stage 11.

Paragraph [0197] discloses performing stress relief heat treatment to the laminated Masahide curved display panel. However, this in no way discloses or suggests "releasing the force to contract the pre-tensioned surface and form a curved surface of the curved flat panel display device," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 18 and 28. The Masahide stress relief heat treatment is performed on an already curved panel and does NOT "form a curved surface" due to release of force to contract the pre-tensioned surface, as recited in independent claims 1, 18 and 28.

Oshikawa is directed to a liquid crystal display panel manufacturing method where, before two substrates of the display panel are adhered to each other, one of the substrates is subjected to thermal expansion. After adhesion, the other substrate is subjected to thermal expansion. As recited on column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 6:

a sealing member 50 is hardened to bond the substrates 20 and 30 to each other, thus obtaining a flat liquid crystal cell having the liquid crystal storing space 11 defined between the substrates. The whole cell thus formed is subjected to the thermal expansion process wherein the cell is heated and then cooled, as a result of which the substrate 30, which

has not been subjected to the thermal expansion process prior to adhesion, expands considerably, whereas the substrate 20, subjected to the thermal expansion process before adhesion, does not expand significantly. Thus, the substrates 20 and 30 are curved due to the difference between the amount of thermal expansion of the substrates. (Emphasis added)

Oshikawa does not even disclose or suggest pre-tensioning a non-precurved film by a force to form a pre-tensioned surface, and adhering another non-precurved film to the pre-tensioned surface. The Oshikawa substrate 20, which is subjected to thermal expansion process before adhesion, is NOT under any tension and does NOT form any pre-tensioned surface on which the other substrate 30 is adhered to.

Rather, both Oshikawa substrates 20 and 30 are in a relaxed state and NOT under tension and adhered to each other, and thus there is NO release of any "force to contract the pre-tensioned surface and form a curved surface of the curved flat panel display device," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 18 and 28.

In Oshikawa, the curved surface is not formed from the release of any tension of a pre-tensioned surface. Rather, the Oshikawa curved surface is formed from heating and cooling the whole cell as

a result of which the previously un-expanded substrate 30 expands considerably, whereas the previously expanded substrate 20 does not expand significantly.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that Masahide, Oshikawa, and combination thereof, do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 13 and 16 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):


pre-tensioning the second non-precurved film
by a force to form a pre-tensioned surface;
adhering the first non-precurved film to the
pre-tensioned surface; and
releasing the force to contract the pre-
tensioned surface and form a curved surface of
the curved flat panel display device.

Yamamoto and Hashimoto are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Masahide and Oshikawa. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 18 and 28 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 6-7, 19, 21-27 and 29-32 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1, 18 and 28.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
June 16, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101